

**REMARKS**

**I. Formalities**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document submitted in the parent application.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the reference WO 9707641 (originally submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on December 27, 2001) and for initialing this reference on the PTO 1449 Form submitted by Applicant on November 3, 2004.

However, the Examiner still has not indicated whether the Formal Drawing filed on December 27, 2001 is accepted. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge and approve the aforementioned Formal Drawing.

**II. Status of the Application**

By the present amendment, claims 1-8 and 10 have been amended. Claims 1-8 and 10 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-8 and 10 have been rejected.

The present amendment addresses each point of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**III. Specification Objection**

The Examiner has objected to the Specification for various informalities. The informalities noted by the Examiner have been corrected as set forth above. Thus, withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,108,554 to Kawamoto (hereinafter “Kawamoto”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for *at least* the independent reasons stated below.

According to the MPEP, “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” (MPEP § 2131). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-8 and 10 positively recite limitations which are not disclosed (or suggested) by Kawamoto.

##### **A. Independent Claim 1**

For example, independent claim 1 recites (among other things):

...providing, by a notifying information service provider to said user, a notification which includes a capability to accept a service of an offered information service provider different from a service of said notifying information service provider.

The grounds of rejection allege that a taxi company, as disclosed in Kawamoto, corresponds to a “service provider,” as recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the grounds of rejection.

Kawamoto fails to disclose the feature of a notification which includes a capability to accept a service of an offered information service provider, as recited in claim 1. In contrast to the recitations of claim 1, Kawamoto discloses that a server 24 retrieves all the reply information included in the additional information of the agent from the respective clients 55 to 57 which

coincide with the request of the user and transmits the retrieval result through the simplified portable telephone system network 23 to the portal terminal 21. (Column 7, lines 28-34). Kawamoto also discloses that, depending on this reply information, the user communicates the detail location information through the PHS or the like to the client the user desires, and takes a taxi at the time the client designates. (Column 7, lines 34-38).

However, a taxi company as disclosed in Kawamoto is completely different from an information service provider, as recited in claim 1. In fact, contrary to the recitations of claim 1, a taxi company does not provide any information services whatsoever.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by (i.e. is not readable on) Kawamoto for *at least* these independent reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

## **B. Independent Claim 2**

Independent claim 2 recites (among other things):

...a notifier to provide a notification to said user, said notification including a capability for said user to accept a service of an offered second information service provider different from the service of said information service provider.

In view of the similarity between these requirements and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 apply *at least* by analogy to claim 2. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is patentably distinguishable over Kawamoto *at*

*least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Further, Applicant submits that the dependent claims 3-8 are allowable *at least* by virtue of their dependency on claim 2. Thus, the allowance of these claims is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

**C. Independent Claim 10**

Independent claim 10 recites (among other things):

...said information service provider includes a notifier to provide a notification to said user, said notification including a capability for said user to accept a service of an offered information service provider different from the service of said information service provider.

In view of the similarity between these requirements and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 apply *at least* by analogy to claim 10. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over Kawamoto *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Thus, the allowance of this claim is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
U.S. Application No.: 10/026,768

Attorney Docket No.: Q67918

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Allison M. Tulino  
Registration No. 48,294

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: **July 15, 2005**